

**REMARKS**

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for reviewing the present application.

**Telephone Interview**

Applicant also wishes to thank the Examiner for taking the time to participate in a telephone interview on November 16, 2006 with the undersigned, Carlos Leita0 (employee of assignee), and Brett Slaney (Reg. #58,772).

In the interview, the nature of the terms “workflow” and “activity” was discussed and it was agreed that clarifying language could be added to independent claims 4 and 33 to further define these terms in relation to the framework and method claimed.

Claims 4 and 33 are hereby amended to add such clarifying language as indicated in the claim amendments outlined above. In particular, workflow is defined as including the coordination of at least one activity from outside the application, and an activity is defined as having a property that is modified as a result of the execution of the process definition and applied to the data set during its respective process step to produce an output data set for subsequent use.

Applicant advises that the language defining the term “activity” has always been present in claim 4, specifically, in the “wherein” clause. In amended claim 4, these limitations have been inserted into element (d) to improve readability, and the wherein clause has been removed. Applicant also advises that the term workflow has always been present in claim 4.

Claim 33 is amended in a manner similar to claim 4.

Support for the definition of workflow can be found on page 1, lines 6-23, and support for the definition of activities can be found on page 2, line 28 to page 3, line 2. No new subject matter is believed to have been added by way of these amendments.

The Examiner has acknowledged that the Orton reference (5,717,877) does not teach monitoring workflow as defined in the amended claims. Orton teaches a development

framework and does not coordinate activities from outside an application that can be monitored and interacted within the application, or a process selector for selecting a process definition related to a set of activities.

Accordingly, Applicant believes that amended claims 4 and 33 distinguish over Orton and are in condition for allowance.

### **Objection to the Claims— 35 U.S.C. 103**

Claims 4, 6-15, 18-33 and 35-51 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orton et al. As discussed above, the clarifying language added to claims 4 and 33 are believed to clearly distinguish claims 4 and 33 over Orton, as Orton is silent as to monitoring workflow and applying activities to a data set during such workflow as recited in the claims. Claims 6-15 and 18-32 being dependent on claim 4 and claims 35-51 being dependent on claim 33 are also believed to distinguish over Orton for at least that reason. Applicant refers the Examiner to the response filed July 28, 2006 for additional remarks regarding the Orton reference.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes that all pending claims, namely, claims 4, 6-15, 18-33 and 35-51 are in condition for allowance and requests early reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Dated: December 8, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By:       Daniel G. Nguyen      

Daniel G. Nguyen

Registration No. 42,933

JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL  
CORPORATION

5 Houston Center

1401 McKinney, Suite 2600

Houston, Texas 77010

(713) 951-3300

Attorneys for Applicant